



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXXII.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1910.

No. 9

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,

PUBLISHERS,

31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Cable Address, "Peace, Boston."

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

Make all checks payable to the American Peace Society. To personal checks on Western and Southern banks add ten cents for collecting.

| CONTENTS. | PAGE |
|---|---------|
| EDITORIALS | 205-208 |
| The Newfoundland Fisheries Award—Shall the Panama Canal be Fortified—The Interparliamentary Conference at Brussels—The Progress of Arbitration. | |
| EDITORIAL NOTES | 209-211 |
| The Orinoco Claims Case—Increased 400 per cent. in Thirteen Years—Andrew D. White's Autobiography—Our Desire for Real Peace—William James—German Students in England—A Seattle Story—Swedish Methodists on Peace. | |
| NEWS FROM THE FIELD..... | 211 |
| BREVITIES..... | 211 |
| GENERAL ARTICLES: | |
| Text of the Decision of the Hague Tribunal in the Newfoundland Fisheries Arbitration..... | 212-214 |
| The United States—Canadian Peace Centennial | 214-215 |
| Humane Teaching and International Peace. <i>Carl Heath</i> | 215-217 |
| Baron II Kamon, the Man Who Prevented War Between the United States and Japan in 1852. <i>J. H. DeForest, D. D.</i> | 217-219 |
| Prof. William James' Peace Utopia..... | 219-220 |
| Christianity and Pacifism. <i>Alfred Mohn</i> | 220-223 |
| The Field Secretary's Report for September. <i>Charles E. Beals</i> | 223 |
| NEW BOOKS | 224-225 |
| International Arbitration and Peace Lecture Bureau..... | 225 |

The Newfoundland Fisheries Award.

The award of the Hague Court in the Newfoundland Fisheries case, which had been looked forward to with so much interest, was announced on the 7th of September. We give elsewhere in this issue the full text of the decision, which we hope our friends everywhere will take time to read.

A careful reading of the document makes it clear that the judges were actuated by the highest and purest motives and that they did their utmost, in an impartial way, to find out where justice lay in each of the claims made by the two governments. It is made equally evident, by the text of the decision, that justice was not wholly on either side, but in considerable measure on both sides, as is generally the case in all important controversies. Arbitration is often spoken of as leading only to a compromise and not to the determination of the strict justice of the case. This may be true in instances, but it is much less frequently so than many think. No great international controversy ever springs up and develops unless there is more or less right on both sides. In this fisheries case, at any rate, justice lay

on both sides, and the court cannot be accused of compromising because it said so. The fisheries tribunal has shown clearly that an arbitration court may be, in the truest sense of the term, a court of justice.

Of the seven questions submitted to the court, five were decided in favor of the United States. These questions, as will be seen by consulting them and the answers to them, were important. They were not, however, the most important. On the two crucial questions, numbers one and five, on which the press have nearly universally declared that Great Britain won, it is not easy to determine from the text of the award which government gets the most, Great Britain or the United States. The sovereign right of Great Britain or her colonies to make regulations, in the form of municipal laws or ordinances, governing the fisheries without consulting the United States, is affirmed. But this right, the tribunal says, is limited by the treaty of 1818, and such regulations must not be in violation of the treaty provisions. They must be fair and equitable and not give advantage to British over American fishermen. The question whether any regulation is unreasonable, if raised, must be decided not by either of the parties alone, but be referred to an impartial authority. Thus both the sovereign rights of Great Britain and the treaty rights of the United States are safeguarded. It would seem, therefore, that both governments have got in the decision on this question substantially, if not formally, what they contended for.

The decision on question five, that of the lines from which the three marine miles shall be measured in the non-treaty bays, has been generally, we think, misunderstood by the papers. In a general way, as the text of the award shows, the contention of our government that these three marine miles are to be measured following the sinuosities of the coast, is clearly sustained by the court. The only exception is that where the body of water ceases to have the configuration and characteristics of an open bay or, in other words, becomes practically territorial water, the line from which measurement is made shall there be drawn across the body of water. This shall, however, never be farther out than where the body of water is ten miles wide. This is in apparent contravention of the declaration that the three miles are to be measured following the sinuosities of the bays. But, evidently, the judges found something in the character of the inward ends of a number of the bays which led them to see that fishermen could not easily